DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 970 SP 026 465

AUTHOR Adler, Susan
TITLE The Irony of Professionalization.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; Personal Autonomy; *Power Structure; *Professional Recognition; Teacher Stereotypes; *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

Professionalization has been a recurring theme among educators since the nineteenth century. This paper explores the historical origins and development of the concept and processes of professionalization, both in general and applied to the occupation of teaching. The author argues that professionalization, viewed in its historical and cultural context, presents an inherent contradiction. While the rhetoric of professionalization holds a promise of enhanced autonomy and control for members of an occupation, the reality may often be a "deskilling" of teachers. Historical and sociological data are used to support this hypothesis. A history of professionalization is briefly discussed along with the development of an ideology of professionalization. The author describes the processes by which a hierarchical status structure within education seems to have developed. This is a structure within which practitioners have little power and recognition while research and policymakers may control the knowledge and behaviors of classroom practice. Thus ironically, the language and beliefs of professionalization may be used to mask teachers' lack of autonomy and control. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258970

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE IRONY OF PROFESSIONALIZATION

Susan Adler
Rockhurst College
Kansas City, MO 64110

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S.A. Adler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 31 - April 4, Chicago, IL.

SP 026 465

The Irony of Professionalization

Professionalization has been a recurring theme among educators throughout the twentieth century. Waller noted as early as 1932 that professionalization, the process whereby an occupation gains recognition as a profession, had been proposed by some as a remedy to the low status of teachers. More recently, concern with burnout and low teacher morale has been linked to the lack of professional status of educators. In this light, this essay seeks to examine what meanings and assumptions underlie the language of professionalization, and to examine the concept as both a process and an ideology or shared system of beliefs. This inquiry seeks to place the process and beliefs of professionalization within the context of the history and the social structures in which it is situated.

In examining the meanings and consequences of professionalization, one might focus inquiry in a number of directions. One might inquire about the effects of professionalization on those to whom the professionals administer, school children, for example. Or one might explore its consequences on educational institutions or on the selection of knowledge taught. Or one might wonder about the dilemma between the autonomy of the professional and the teacher's accountability to the community. Each of these is an important question and part of a broad view of professionalization. This essay, however, shall focus specificially on the possible consequences of professionalization on the practitioner, the teacher in the classroom.[1]

Teacher Stress and the Response of Professionalizaton

The disillusionment and dissatisfaction of teachers with the occupation of teaching is a concern to many interested in the work of teaching, as well as in quality education. In several recent surveys, nearly half the teachers questioned indicated that they would not again choose teaching as a career (Sparks, 1979; Wanberg, Metzger and Levitov, 1982). Educational literature suggests several sources of this dissatisfaction: teachers are poorly paid; the occupation does not offer a career ladder to reward ambitious practioners; teaching is not held in high esteem by the public. Lortie (1975) argues that the rewards of teaching are rewards of psychic gratification-the perception that one has "reached one's students." Such a reward is highly personal and uncertain. The uncertainty of success in the classroom and, therefore, the uncertainity of satisfaction with the job, are major occupational characteristics. Thus it is difficult for the occupation to provide a rewarding, successful experience for practitioners.

The precariousness of the rewards of teaching are further exacerbated by the stresses associated with teaching. A plethora of articles on stress and burnout can be found (Schug, 1983). The causes for stress which are cited include: the "future shock" of new kinds of students and new trends in curriculum (Keith, 1979); the vandalism and violence of many urban schools (Leff, 1980); time demands, large classes, and a lack of educational resources (Kyriacov and Sutcliffe, 1978); the isolation of teachers (Lortie, 1975). Many factors beyond the control of teachers

appear to impinge upon their professional lives. Lack of control may well be heightened by personal and profesional isolation. The egg-crate structure of many schools isolates the teacher in the classroom, inhibiting substantive interaction with other adults. Teachers traditionally receive little feedback from their peers and are often unable to draw upon their resources. In some schools, teachers are actually discouraged from seeking the help of their colleagues (e.g. McPherson, 1972). They may find themselves professionally alone, with only superficial relationships with peers. Too often, there is no community among teachers (Fruth, et. al., 1982).

With few rewards and low status, with much in the traditional structure of schools that is beyond teachers' control, it is perhaps no surprise that burnout, dropout and stress plague the occupation of teaching. One response to these problems has been to argue that teaching ought to become more of a "profession."

In a 1971 study, Meyer found that teachers working in an organizational structure which encouraged work related interaction perceived themselves as more autonomous and influential that did teachers in traditional schools. The former reported, in turn, being more satisfied with their work. Follow-up studies (Cohen, 1976; Molmar, 1971) confirmed the importance of autonomy and influence in contributing to greater job satisfaction (Dreeben, 1972; Lortie, 1975). Still others have argued that the common culture and technology of a profession would equip teachers with skills and knowledge needed to allow them a greater control over their work environment and, further,

to enhance their prestige and status in the community.

Such research and arguments lend support to the belief that professionalization is a appropriate response to problems of stress and burnout. But just what does becoming a professional mean? What is a profession and what are the implications of professionalization? The answers to these questions require that we examine the concept of professionalization critically and that we place this concept in its social and historical context. Rather than take for granted that we understand the implications of professionalization, we would do well to question the assumptions and values embedded in it.

Professionalization

Sociologists have noted several defining features which distinguish a professiona from other occupations (e.g., Lieberman, 1956: Ritzer, 1977). One is the claim to an esoteric body of knowledge which is not readily available to everyone; in fact, such knowledge can best be gained through an extended period of professional training and education. As a result of this training and the development of expertise, members of a profession lay claim to considerable autonomy in action and decision-making. In exchange, the profession assures the public of ethical behavior and control of its members. Although these characteristics seem to define what is meant by "professional," it is instructive to examine the concept as it is, and has been, manifest in practice.

Modern professions, such as medicine and law, first emerged in England during the eighteenth century (Larson, 1977). Their evolution was tied to the breakdown of traditional forms of authority such

as religion and birthright (Bledstein, 1978; Popkewitz, 1982) and to advances in industrial and corporate capitalism, in science, and in cognitive rationality (Larson, 1977). The movement toward professionalism was characterized by the development of new criteria for establishing authority and prestige. Just as industrialists and merchants sought to create and control markets for their products, so too did groups offering a service, such surgeons and attorneys, seek to create and control a commodity and a market. Unlike the product of the industrialist and the merchants, however, what the aspiring professionals offered for sale was the service they could render. It became necessary to demonstrate the superiority of one type of service over another.

The acquisition of scientific knowledge, and the credentials to demonstrate that one possessed that knowledge, became the new criteria for authority (Bledstein, 1976). The laws of science replaced the laws of God and the professional claimed legitimacy by appealing to those laws. To have control over a service acknowledged as essential was a mechanism to establish an arena of power. Scientific knowledge, with its claim to universal and predictable rules, became the basis for claims to authority, control, and power.

Legal reformers in the years before the Civil War, for example, advocated major changes in the knowledge base of the legal profession. These reformers called for a scientific codification of American law. They stressed the importance of statutory and universal principles, of systematic codes, of reliable rules and methods, of objective statements of liability and restraint. Thus, although this knowledge base was, and is, not based on pure science, nineteenth century re-

forms were intended to organize legal knowledge along scientific principles of standardization and objectivity (Bledstein, 1978).

Knowledge and expertise, with the accompanying credentials, were a key to upward mobility. An occupation's claim to the superiority of their product, i.e., their service, rested on a claim to a cognitive base. It was this claim which provided a new way for the middle class to gain status through alleged worth. Professionalization was, in short, an expression of collective mobility in a social setting in which traditional forms of authority and control were weakening (Larson, 1977).

The emergence of institutions of higher education as the centers for the production of knowledge and the training of practitioners was an important component in the rise of professionalism. A monopoly of competence needs a cognitive base, one which is specific and formalized enough to allow some standardization of "product," but not so clearly codified that anyone could have access. The production of, and the access to, such knowledge must be controlled by the profession if the profession is to have the power to maintain a monopoly of service. In a society where a positivistic science has come to represent the legimate system of cognitive validation (Larson, 1977), the knowledge base of a profession has come to be that which is based on the rules, procedures and assumptions of the "scientific method."

Higher education became the institutional form in which both prolonged training and the production of knowledge were embedded (Bledstein, 1976; Larson, 1977). As both research and training

centers, universities came to produce knowledge and to train and socialize members into the profession. A dichotomy of practical and theoretical knowledge grew as the epistomological "superiority" of theoretical knowledge came to be taken for granted in our society. Knowledge produced by universities was knowledge with a scientific basis, knowledge with an appearance of neutrality. Practitioners in the recognized professions, as well as the public, came to acknowledge and support the professional hierarchy which centers knowledge production and training of practitioners in the university.

In its historical context we can begin to see professionalization as more than specific attributes of an occupation. The most important characteristic of a profession is the recognition by the community that it is, indeed, a profession (Ritzer, 1977). Whether or not an occupation actually possesses a body of theoretical knowledge to which there is limited access, is less important than the public's perception of this power base. Whether or not a profession can actually control the ethics of its members is less important than the public's grant of permission to do so. In short, what an occupation has aspired to in the process of professionalization, has been the power to win public confidence and to hold a monopoly on the service it offers.

The Professionalization of Teaching

The nineteenth and twentieth century development of the occupation of teaching reflects some of this evolution toward professionalization. Teaching in the early nineteenth century was a "calling" with quasi-spiritual properties (Mattingly, 1975). Professionalization in those early years was perceived in religious terms; Henry Barnard, for

example, spoke of the need to create a "priesthood of teachers"(Curti, 1978). During the nineteenth century, however, there was a shift from viewing teaching as a calling to an emphasis on secular expertise, an expertise no longer based on social status or the authority of God. By the twentieth century, advances in statistics and behavioral psychology, particularly the work of Thorndike and Watson, provided the foundation for an empirical approach to education. A "science of education, based in the universities, began to develop and to become the basis for educators' claims to professionalization"(Borrowman, 1956). Institutions of higher education increasingly became places for both the training of teachers and for scientific research in educaton. The quest to find social laws applicable to education and to teach these to practitioners became an important function of schools of education. Universities developed as centers for the production of a technology of teaching. In turn, the pre-service teacher could be taught the skills and knowledge of effective teaching (Adler, 1984). This development fits, at least roughly, the historical process of professionalization already discussed. Through a combination of research and training, educators could strive to train teachers who would then be the experts who would practice these skills and implement this knowledge within specific contexts.

The Contradiction of Professionalization

The claim that teaching is a profession must rest by definition, on the prior claim that education has a specific cognitive base and that access to that knowledge depends upon professional training. Teaching as a profession is thus embedded in notions of scientific

expertise, of the importance of rules and procedures, of teacher competencies and instructional systems. The development of such rules, competencies and systems would appear to enhance the professionalization of teaching. A claim to a set of educational principles to guide planning, teaching and evaluation would seem to bolster the claim to professional status. The curriculum and methods established through scientific research appear to take teachers beyond individualistic craft into the realm of scientific and neutral skills, methods and knowledge. As a science of education is developed, it would seem that teachers would become true experts in the provision of a necessary service. The occupation, it would appear, thus approaches the requisites of a profession and, by definition, the autonomy and social status of the practitioner is enhanced.

But herein lies the contradiction of professionalization. The quest to develop and refine principles of teaching and learning often, in practice, contributes to and promotes the powerlessness of practitioners. The researchers' search for a scientific, cognitive base for education may have consequences for practitioners very different from those embodied in the language of professionalization. The development of rules and procedures for effective teaching can have the contradictory effect of taking from teachers a part of their craft. The production of knowledge in universities and R. and D. centers has perhaps bolstered the claim to a cognitive base but, at the same time, it has contributed to a separation of conception from practice (e.g., Apple, 1982). Goals, processes and outcomes are defined by people external to the practice of teaching. With the rapid growth of prepackaged

curriculum materials, teaching is often reduced to management, to the application of predetermined procedures to obtain predetermined outcomes (Gitlin, 1980). The production of knowledge is centered, not in places of practice, but developed elsewhere and passed on to practitioners. Teachers are expected to apply techniques that are regarded as neutral, objective and beyond human involvement.

In the 1960's, in response to concerns that American educators lacked academic rigor, a good deal of time and money was spent to develop curriculum that would address the central principles of disciplines of study. The knowledge and skills of experts in a variety of fields were called upon to create higher caliber curriculums which could be implemented by classroom teachers. The teacher was provided with objectives, activities, evaluation procedures and background information. Such curriculum was, in a sense, created to be "teacher-proof" - one had only to follow the steps and procedures provided.[2]

Much has been written since then about the preceived failure of these "new" curricula (see, for example, Sarason, 1977). It appeared that the "new" math, the "new" social studies, often continued to be taught in "old" ways. One might account for this by examining the inertia of the system and the powerful culture of the institution. But, importantly, teachers often resisted the intended implementation of new curricula because they were unwilling to suspend their own judgments and their own knowledge of their classrooms and of teaching itself (e.g., Boag, 1980).

It has been argued that education is a "loosely coupled" system (Cohen, 1978; Meyer, 1978) and that despite administrative mandates, or "teacher-proof" curriculum, a teacher behind the closed door of the classroom has real autonomy in day-to-day classroom affairs. This autonomy has been cited as one reason for the failure of the "new" curricula. It has also been cited as a barrier to the professionalization of teachers. Teachers, so the argument goes, lack a sense of professional collegiality and allegiance to a professional community.

The attempt to implement methods and curricula produced by non-practitioners did not die with the waning of the "new" curricula of the 1960's. Today, the practitioner confronts community demands for accountability and district and state demands both for uniform and clearly spelled out objectives, and for the application of instructional systems. Prepackaged curricula and administrative mandates have intruded into the working lives of many teachers, especially in elementary schools. These may go a long way toward implementing the findings of educational researchers, but they do little to enhance the decision-making responsibilities and opportunities of the classroom teacher. They do little, in actual practice, to enhance the power and autonomy of the teacher. Rather than promoting professional interaction and collective autonomy, the external production of knowledge requires little significant decision-making among teachers; everything is rationalized and specified by outsiders (Apple, 1982). What interaction is promoted by prepackaged curricula is over technical matters such as management (Gitlin, 1980). Questions about the

arrangement of children or time replace problems of what to teach, how to teach, and how to evaluate what has been learned.[3]

The irony inherent in the professionalization of education is apparent. Researchers strive to develop the scientific, cognitive base necessary to lay claim to professional status. Standardization of techniques and outcomes may create the facade of a professional community in which teachers manage their classrooms in similar ways. But in fact, such standardization does not create a community of professionals for it does little to enhance the autonomy and power of the practitioner. Instead, professionalization justifies a hierarchial status structure within the establishment of education. This is a structure within which the practitioner, often a woman, has little power and little recognition and researchers, and administrators, often men, increasingly come to control the knowledge and behaviors of classroom practice (see Apple, 1983). Rather than enhancing the professional status of teachers, rather than bringing to teachers the psychic rewards than can come with a sense of autonomy and control, professionalization can serve to contradict the professional claims of teachers.

The Language of Professionalization

How is it then, that many, including practitioners, look to a process of professionalization to enhance the autonomy and power of the classroom teacher? Part of the answer lies in the language of professionalization. Language serves not merely to describe, not merely as a tool for telling us about events. It functions, as well, to create events (Edelman, 1977; Popkewitz, 1982). Language serves to shape our thinking and, in turn, to facilitate the legitimization

of established authorities and practices. More than expression of, it helps, also, to create those perceptions. Symbolic forms can function to deflect attention from critical inquiry; the actual consequences of institutional affairs can be hidden behind the symbolic forms or slogans. Particular slogans, such as professionalization, can arouse interest, enthusiasm, even commitment. But what the slogan actually means may be taken for granted and, in practice, the unity and agreement which the slogan seems to signify, may mask a varieyt of beliefs and practices.

The language of professionalization legimates teachers' quest for autonomy and status. It also legitimates practices which undermine this quest. Thus the language of professionalization serves to legitimate an occupational social structure which fails to serve in the best interests of all the members of the occupation. Let us look more closely at the beliefs the language of professionalization carries with it and at how these may function to obscure reality.

The language of professionalization expresses, in shorthand, symbolic form, a belief system often unquestioningly accepted. This system is made up of several components (Larson, 1977). First, the concept of professionalization expresses a moral hierarchy of intelligence, effort, dignity and freedom. Our society has accepted as given that knowledge through formal education allows the individual to gain control of situations and to have access to more prestigious roles in life (e.g., Sennett and Cobb, 1972). The belief is that through effort and intelligence, one can gain professional credentials and the dignity and freedom that go with them. The professional route of mobility,

it appears, is meritocratic and open to all. Failure, in such a system, is one's own.

The language of professionalization also contains a belief which equates power with ability and the development of self. Although professionalization is a collective effort, the goals it wins are individualitistic. The individual gains power, recognition, income and personal empowerment. Recognition of merit and competence are not gains that collective bargaining can win.

The third component of the belief system embedded in the concept of professionalization involves power. The knowledge of the professional is viewed as beneficent power. The professional has access to the rules, procedures and systematic knowledge which establish competence and, therefore, trust. The professional is seen as one who has power over worldly experience and this power is viewed as outside the realm of politics, personality and partisanship (Popkewitz, 1982). The professional can lay claim to expertise about major sectors of public and private life, expertise which is claimed to be superior to common sense knowledge based on daily experiences. It follows, then, that one ought to defer to the experts in matters of medicine, law, welfare, education and even sex in order not to harm one's self or others (Lasch, 1977).

Finally, professionalization carries with it a belief in the respect for science and technology. The beliefs described above are accepted because the professional is one who has access to the objective, neutral laws of science. The application of these laws is seen as the road to social and personal betterment. It is this science which allows the

professional the claim to modern day moral authority.

Thus the language of professionalization carries with it a loaded belief system. It serves to establish a sense of reality not opened to questions. It suggests we are coping with a problem, such as the lack of autonomy and control of teachers, when, in fact, it may be perpetuating, even exacerbating, the problem. The language of professionalization represents a symbol for the beliefs described above and draws attention from a critical analysis of the lived reality. The actual consequences of institutional activity are hidden behind the symbolic forms.

The acceptance of the rhetoric of professionaliztion rest in its appeal to science. The very concept of professionalization is embedded in a cultural context which looks to science to validate and vindicate authority. The language of professionalization is a language of science. It suggests that high quality professional service is based upon the proper application of the findings of scientific research. It draws attention to objective rules and procedures and relies on public confidence and belief in such procedures. By doing so, it creates an image of competence and control and perpetuates unexplored beliefs about the process.

Professionalization and Bureaucracy

The model of modern professionalization first emerged in the historical context of competitive capitalism. And, in fact, the professional model described earlier is that of the free practitioner in the market of service. But in our age of corporate capitalism and large scale bureaucracy, the model of professionalization maintains its appeal. It is still something to be attained, although the settings of work and

practice have assumed markedly different forms. The bureaucratic structure, rather than being in conflict with the model of professionalization, provides a context for it (Larson, 1977). The language of professionalization is also the language of bureaucracy. While professional claims rest upon an appeal to technology and science, the language of professional science is more a language of bureaucracy than that of scientific inquiry (Popkewitz, 1982).

Bureaucratic language transforms notions of power into those of authority based upon the legitimacy of expertise. The bureaucratic path to success is based upon the acquisition of the tools and knowledge of the job. Decisions are based upon expertise and are carried out in a seemingly neutral and objective fashion. The language of bureaucracy focuses upon human activity in a specialized and neutral way, treating discreet aspects of a system rather than a dynamic whole and paying extreme attention to procedures and rules. It is a language which emphasizes the application of appropriate techniques to realize defined goals under given conditions (Edelmen, 1977). The similarity between the professional claims of education and the language of bureaucracy is striking. The bureaucratic context of teaching does not contradict the language of professionalization; rather, it is consonant with its claims.

Conclusions

I have argued that the promise of professionalization is a promise of enhanced autonomy and control for the members of an occupation. But the reality of professionalization, in its historical and social context, presents an inherent contradiction. As claims for a more scientific cognitive base are made, the practitioner is put at a greater distance

from the production of knowledge. In the guise of professionalization, teaching as craft, and as a creative act, is changed to teaching as implementation and management. Teachers who are involved in implementing the technology produced by educational research may feel they are doing 'the best thing' and acting 'more professionally' (Gitlin, 1980). But, upon careful analysis, autonomy and control are more illusory than real. Professionalization, as described above, seems to contribute more to alienation than to the development of professional community. The practitioner is alienated from peers, since interaction is focused on the technical, and little time or energy remains for reflective, and sometimes even for social, interactions. The teacher is alienated from pupils who are cast in a role of deficient clients to whom certain procedures must be administered. There is alienation from the universities where knowledge is produced; teachers complain about the scholars' lack of reality base. And there is alienation from administrators, those who have management expertise - and power.

The quality of a teacher's work life may be little enhanced by the growing sophistication of education science. But this reality is too often obscured by the language of professionalization. The very process which separates the conception of curriculum from its implementation is hidden by the symbolic content of the ideology of professionalization. Professionalization becomes a facade for the continued, and in some cases even worsened, controls under (or despite) which teachers must function.

I do not intend to make the argument that research in education is necessarily meaningless in the classroom or harmful to the practitioner.

I do argue that there is a hierarchal power structure within the educational establishment and that this structure, with the practitioner at the bottom, and the implications of this structure, ought to be recognized and not hidden behind the ideology of professionalization.

This essay has suggested some of the implications and effects of this hierarchy on the quality of the practitioners' work life. The practical knowledge of the teacher is disparaged in face of the more theoretical knowledge of the universities and R. and D. centers. Separated from the production of knowledge, the teacher who accepts this "professional" status quo is reduced to the role of technician, carrying out the goals and mandates of others.

There are, of course, alternatives - alternatives for the way we view the members of the educational hierarchy and the roles that each can play. As we question the consequences of our patterns of implementing educational science, we will be in a better position to consider these alternatives. As we consider problems of teacher morale and burnout, for example, we must ask about the extent to which current practices to improve the professional status of education have actually contributed to a decrease of power and control for teachers. If the teacher is viewed as a technician, expected to execute the planning of others, then the teacher is cut off from making responsible, professional choices. If efficiency is the goal of curriculum, and teachers are to be managers only, then classroom practice will be cut off from its moral roots, from important questions about what is to be taught and why.

The promise of autonomy and power which the language of professionalization holds for teachers is a powerful one. But the promise will

not be fulfilled by delimiting, in the guise of professionalization, the role of the classroom teacher. Indeed, a powerful reason cited for teacher dropout has been the perception that teaching limits personal growth and creativity (e.g., Fruth et al., 1982). The role of teachers. however, may be seen in different ways - ways which acknowledge that the work of teaching involves complexities and uncertainties. Such work is more than a sum of skills and knowledge transmitted by researchers to practitioners. It is a creative process as well (Eisenstein, 1972); it is a craft which is based on teachers' abilities to analyze and act in particular situations. As Carew and Lightfoot (1979) wrote: "Teachers are the most profound and experienced knowers of the classroom scene" (p. 21). The knowledge of the classroom teacher is not merely that of the unsophisticated practitioner; it is the knowledge of experience and practice in a complex social setting.

It may well be that the rewards of teaching come from this very craft and creativity. The ability to take pride in one's craft, to act creatively and imaginatively, to put one's personal mark on one's work may be the essence of reward and satisfaction in teaching (Eisner, 1983).

Our challenge is to remain tentative in our views toward teaching and learning, to question what otherwise might be accepted as natural and normal, to maintain and attitude that is critical and skeptical, and to not accept the language and the labels, such as professionalization, without paying a good deal of attention to the lived reality behind them.

NOTES

1. Both the processes involved in professionalization and the beliefs contained in its rhetoric are complex and do not have impact on all educators in a like manner. The claims I make in this essay are the claims of a general tendency, not of unvarying uniformity of effects. Nonetheless, while exceptions to these processes are important, the general trends are significant ones.
2. As Apple notes (1983), there was an implicit sexism in this process as the largely male academic body of consultants and developers intervene in the practice of a largely female workforce.
3. This is not to say that all districts and all schools mandate curriculum and determine the lives of teachers in identical ways or that teachers are no longer capable of resisting the mandates or adapting the packages. This latter is an important point. As Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Wehlage demonstrate, school may implement the same curriculum in very different ways. See Thomas Popkewitz, B. Robert Tabachnick, and Gary Wehlage, The Myth of Educational Reform. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

REFERENCES

Adler, S. "Teacher Education": Taking An Historical Perspective." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1984.

Apple, M. W. Education and Power. Boston: Rutledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Apple, M. W. "Work, Gender and Teaching." Teachers College Record, Spring, 1983, 84, (3), pp. 611-622.

Bledstein, B. J. The Culture of Professionalism. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1976.

Boag, N. H. Teacher Perception of Curricular Change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Alberta, 1980.

Carew, J. and Lightfoot, S. Beyond Bias: Perspectives on Classrooms. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Cohen, E. "Problems and Prospects of Training." Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Standford University, 1976.

Curti, M. The Social Ideas of American Educators. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1978.

Dreeben, R. The Nature of Teaching. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1970.

Edelman, M. Political Language: Words That Succeed and Policies That Fail. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Eisenstein, H. S. " Professionalization and Teaching: A Critque." Urban Education, April, 1972, 7, pp. 79-93.

Eisner, E. W. "The Art and Craft of Teaching." Educational Leadership. January, 1983, 40 (4), pp. 4-13.

Fruth, M. J., Bredeson, P. V. and Kastin, K. L. Commitment to Teaching: Teachers' Responses to Organizational Incentives. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, February, 1980.

Gitlin, A. Understanding The Work of Teachers. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1980.

Keith, P. M. "Correlates of Role Strain in the Classroom." Urban Education. April, 1979, 14 (1), pp. 19-30.

Kyriacov, C. and Sutcliffe, J. "Teacher Stress: Prevalence, Sounds and Symptoms." British Journal of Educational Psychology. 1978, 48, pp. 159-167.

References (cont'd)

Lasch, C. Haven In a Heartless World: The Family Beseiged. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.

Leff, L. "Schools Try to Ease On-The-Job Pressure As More Teachers Succumb to "Burnout.'" Wall Street Journal, February, 29, 1980, pp. 16.

Lortie, D. School Teacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Larson, M. S. The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Lieberman, M. Education As a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Mattingly, P.L. The Classless Profession. New York: New York University Press, 1975.

McPherson, G. Small Town Teacher. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Meyer, J. and Rowan, B. "The Structure of Educational Organizations." In M. W. Meyers and Association, Environments and Organization: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Molmer, S. "Teachers In Teams: Interaction, Influence and Autonomy." Stanford, California: Stanford University School of Education, 1971 (Technical Report # 22).

Popkewitz, T. "The Problem of Curriculum Research: The Possiblilities and Pathologies of a Science of Schooling." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982.

Ritzer, G. Working: Conflict and Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Sarason, S. The Culture of School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Schug, M. "Teacher Burnout and Professionalism." Issues in Education. 1983, 1 (2 and 3), pp. 133-153.

Schwanke, D. (comp.) Teacher Stress: Selectec ERIC Resources. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1981.

Sennett, R. and Cobb, J. The Hidden Injuries of Class. New York: Random House, 1972.

Sparks, D. "A Biased Look at Teacher Job Satisfaction." Clearinghouse. May, 1979, 52, (9), pp. 447-449.

References (cont'd)

Tom, A. R. "Teaching as a Moral Craft: A Metaphor for Teaching and Teacher Education." Curriculum Inquiry, 1980, 10, (3), pp. 317-323.

Waller, W. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Wanberg, E., Metzger, D. and Levitov, O. "Working Conditions and Career Options Lead to Female Elementary Teacher Job Dissatisfaction." Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 33 (5), pp. 47-40.

The Irony of Professionalization

ABSTRACT

Professionalization has been a recurring theme among educators since the nineteenth century. This paper explores the historical origins and development of the concept and processes of professionalization, both in general and applied to the occupation of teaching. The author argues that professionalization, viewed in its historical and cultural context, presents an inherent contradiction. While the rhetoric of professionalization holds a promise of enhanced autonomy and control for members of an occupation, the reality may often be a "deskilling" of teachers.

Historical and sociological data are used to support this hypothesis. A history of professionalization is briefly discussed along with the development of an ideology of professionalization. The author describes the process by which a hierarchal status structure within education seems to have developed. This is a structure within which practitioners have little power and recognition while research and policy makers may control the knowledge and behaviors of classroom practice. Thus ironically, the language and beliefs of professionalization may be used to mask teachers' lack of autonomy and control.